arXiv:1403.2669v2 [math.GR] 1 Feb 2016

On the penetration distance in Garside monoids

Volker Gebhardt, Stephen Tawn

16th January 2016

Abstract

We prove that the exponential growth rate of the regular language of penetration sequences is smaller than the growth rate of the regular language of normal form words, if the acceptor of the regular language of normal form words is strongly connected. Moreover, we show that the latter property is satisfied for all irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type, extending a result by Caruso.

Our results establish that the expected value of the penetration distance $pd(x, y)$ in an irreducible Artin monoid of spherical type is bounded independently of the length of x, if x is chosen uniformly among all elements of given canonical length and y is chosen uniformly among all atoms; the latter in particular explains observations made by Thurston in the context of the braid group, and it shows that all irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type exhibit an analogous behaviour. Our results also give an affirmative answer to a question posed by Dehornoy.

1 Introduction

Random walks on discrete infinite groups are a subject that has received substantial interest; see for instance [KV83, Woe00] and the references therein.

Random walks on the 3-strand braid group were analysed in [MM07]. A complete understanding of random walks on braid groups on a larger number of strands, let alone more general classes of groups such as Artin–Tits groups or Garside groups, has not been achieved yet.

A topic closely related to random walks on Garside groups is the behaviour of the Garside normal forms of random elements: Fixing a position in the normal form, one obtains an induced distribution on the set of simple elements (that is, on the symmetric group in the case of braids) which can be studied. In [GT14], we investigated these induced distributions and observed convergence. More precisely, experimental data suggests that, except for an initial and a final region whose lengths are uniformly bounded, the distributions of the factors of the normal form of sufficiently long random braids depend neither on the position in the normal form nor on the lengths of the random braids.

Both authors acknowledge support under Australian Research Council's Discovery Projects funding scheme (project number DP1094072). Volker Gebhardt acknowledges support under the Government of Spain Projects MTM2010-19355 and MTM2013-44233-P.

MSC-class: 20F36, 43A07 (Primary) 20F69, 60B15 (Secondary)

Keywords: Garside monoids; Artin monoids; random elements; normal forms; regular language; penetration distance; essential transitivity

Stabilisation phenomena in the normal forms of random braids were first observed by Thurston in [ECH+92, Chapter 9]: A remark at the end of the chapter mentions that in experiments with a small number of strands, the multiplication of a braid x in normal form by a simple braid appeared unlikely to affect all factors of the normal form of x; moreover, if one ignores factors that are modified only by conjugation by the Garside element (the half-twist in the case of the braid group), the number of factors that are modified appeared to be "roughly constant". Based on these observations, an alternative algorithm for computing the normal form of a braid was suggested, but the question of proving its efficiency was left open.

In [GT14], we formalised analysing the number of factors in the normal form of an element x of a Garside monoid M that are modified non-trivially (that is, other than by conjugation by the Garside element) when computing the normal form of the product $x \cdot y$; we called this number the *penetration distance* $\mathrm{pd}(x, y)$: For specific distributions of x and y, we described the behaviour of the expected value $\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{pd}]$ of the penetration distance in terms of the growth rates α and β of two regular languages (cf. Section 2.3). More precisely, we proved that, if x is chosen uniformly among all elements of canonical length k and y is chosen uniformly among the atoms, then $\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{pd}]$ is bounded above independently of the value of k if $\alpha < \beta$ holds [GT14, Theorem 4.7]. By explicit calculations, we showed that the latter condition is satisfied for some irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type with a small number of atoms.

In the present paper, we relate the condition $\alpha < \beta$ to certain structural properties of the lattice of simple elements (more precisely, to the connectedness of the acceptor of the regular language of normal forms), and we prove that these properties are satisfied for all irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type.

As a consequence, we establish here that the expected value of the penetration distance is bounded in the sense of [GT14, Theorem 4.7] for all irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type. Thus, the results obtained in this paper in particular explain the behaviour that was observed by Thurston in [ECH+92, Chapter 9] in the case of the braid monoid, and they show that all irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type exhibit an analogous behaviour. Moreover, our results imply that in all irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type, the number of normal form sequences of length k grows as fast as the number of normal form sequences of length k that start with a given proper simple element, answering in the affirmative a question posed by Dehornoy in the context of the braid monoid [Deh07].

We also prove that the expected value of the penetration distance is unbounded for Zappa–Szép products of irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2.1, we recall the basic concepts of normal forms in Garside groups. In Section 2.2, we briefly recall Artin monoids of spherical type; experts may skip this section. In Section 2.3, we recall the regular languages defined in [GT14] to study the expected value of the penetration distance. Section 2.4 recalls the notion of Zappa–Szép products. In Section 3 we define the notions of *essential* simple elements and *essential transitivity*, which will be used in Section 4 to compare the growth rates α and β. Section 5 establishes that irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type

are essentially transitive and have the property that all proper simple elements are essential, and thus that the results of the preceding sections can be applied to this class of monoids.

We thank the Institute for Mathematics at the University of Seville (IMUS) for providing access to a 64-node 512 GB RAM computer; this equipment was used for some of the computations mentioned in Section 5.

2 Background

In order to fix notation, we briefly recall the main concepts used in the paper.

2.1 Garside monoids and Garside normal form

We refer to [DP99, Deh02, DDG+15] for details.

Let M be a monoid with identity element $\mathbf{1}$. The monoid M is called *left-cancellative* if for any x, y, y' in M, the equality $xy = xy'$ implies $y = y'$. Similarly, M is called *right-cancellative* if for any x, y, y' in M, the equality $yx = y'x$ implies $y = y'$. The monoid M is called *cancellative* if it is both left-cancellative and right-cancellative.

For $x, y \in M$, we say that x is a *left-divisor* or *prefix* of y, writing $x \preccurlyeq_M y$, if there exists an element $u \in M$ such that $y = xu$. If the monoid is obvious, we simply write $x \preccurlyeq y$ to reduce clutter. Similarly, we say that x is a *right-divisor* or *suffix* of y, writing $y \succcurlyeq_M x$ or $y \succcurlyeq x$, if there exists $u \in M$ such that $y = ux$. If M does not contain any non-trivial invertible elements, then the relation $\preccurlyeq$ is a partial order if M is left-cancellative, and the relation $\succcurlyeq$ is a partial order if M is right-cancellative.

An element $a \in M \setminus \{\mathbf{1}\}$ is called an *atom* if whenever $a = uv$ for $u, v \in M$, either $u = \mathbf{1}$ or $v = \mathbf{1}$ holds. The existence of atoms implies that M does not contain any non-trivial invertible elements. The monoid M is said to be *atomic* if it is generated by its set $\mathcal{A}$ of atoms and if for every element $x \in M$ there is an upper bound on the length of decompositions of x as a product of atoms, that is, if $||x||_{\mathcal{A}} := \sup\{k \in \mathbb{N} : x = a_1 \cdots a_k \text{ with } a_1, \ldots, a_k \in \mathcal{A}\} < \infty$.

An element $d \in M$ is called *balanced*, if the set of its left-divisors is equal to the set of its right-divisors. In this case, we write $\mathrm{Div}(d)$ for the set of (left- and right-) divisors of d.

Definition 1. A *quasi-Garside structure* is a pair (M, Δ) where M is a monoid and Δ is an element of M such that

(a) M is cancellative and atomic,

(b) the prefix and suffix relations are lattice orders, that is, for any pair of elements there exist a unique least common upper bound and a unique greatest common lower bound with respect to $\preccurlyeq$ respectively $\succcurlyeq$,

(c) Δ is balanced and M is generated by $\mathrm{Div}(\Delta)$.

The element Δ is called a *quasi-Garside element* for M.

If $\mathrm{Div}(\Delta)$ is finite then we say that (M, Δ) is a *Garside structure* and call Δ a *Garside element* for M.

Remark. If (M, Δ) is a quasi-Garside structure in the above sense, then in the terminology of [DDG+15], the set $\mathrm{Div}(\Delta)$ forms a bounded Garside family for the monoid M.

Definition 2. A *(quasi-)Garside monoid* is a cancellative monoid M together with a fixed (quasi-)Garside structure (M, Δ). The elements of $\mathrm{Div}(\Delta)$ are called the *simple elements* of the (quasi-)Garside monoid M.

Remark. If a cancellative monoid admits one (quasi-)Garside structure, it admits infinitely many; cf. Definition 4. Indeed, for the monoid $\mathbb{N}^n$, any element $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{N}_{>0})^n$ can be chosen as the Garside element.

The notion of simple elements, and thus the normal form of an element, depends on the specific (quasi-)Garside element, so different (quasi-)Garside structures for the same monoid must be distinguished.

Notation 3. If M is a left-cancellative atomic monoid, then least common upper bounds and greatest common lower bounds are unique if they exist. In this situation, we will write $x \vee y$ for the $\preccurlyeq$-least common upper bound of $x, y \in M$ if it exists, and we write $x \wedge y$ for their $\preccurlyeq$-greatest common lower bound if it exists. If $x, y \in M$ admit a $\preccurlyeq$-least common upper bound, we define $x \backslash y$ as the unique element of M satisfying $x(x\backslash y) = x \vee y$.

If M is a (quasi-)Garside monoid with (quasi-)Garside element Δ, we write $\mathcal{A}_M$ for the set of atoms, $\mathcal{D}_M$ for the set of simple elements $\mathrm{Div}(\Delta)$, and we define the set of *proper simple elements* as $\mathcal{D}^\circ_M = \mathcal{D}_M \setminus \{\mathbf{1}, \Delta\}$. To avoid clutter, we will usually drop the subscript if there is no danger of confusion.

For any $x \in \mathcal{D}$, there are unique elements $\partial x = \partial_M x \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\widetilde{\partial} x = \widetilde{\partial}_M x \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $x\partial x = \Delta = (\widetilde{\partial} x)x$. We define inductively $\partial^{k+1} x = \partial(\partial^k x)$ and $\widetilde{\partial}^{k+1} x = \widetilde{\partial}(\widetilde{\partial}^k x)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As $\partial(\widetilde{\partial} x) = x = \widetilde{\partial}(\partial x)$ for any $x \in \mathcal{D}$, we can define $\partial^k x = \widetilde{\partial}^{-k} x$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Clearly, $\partial^k x \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ iff $x \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$. Moreover, for any $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$, one has $x \preccurlyeq y$ iff $\partial x \succcurlyeq \partial y$ iff $\partial^2 x \preccurlyeq \partial^2 y$.

For $x \in M$ the *starting set* $S(x)$ of x is the set of atoms that are prefixes of x. Similarly, the *finishing set* $F(x)$ of x is the set of atomic suffixes of x:

$$S(x) = \{a \in \mathcal{A} : a \preccurlyeq x\} \qquad F(x) = \{a \in \mathcal{A} : x \succcurlyeq a\}$$

Given a set X we will write $X^* = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} X^i$ for the set of strings (of finite length) of elements of X. We will write ε for the empty string and separate the letters of a string with dots, for example we will write $a \,.\, b \,.\, a \in \{a, b\}^*$.

Given a (quasi)-Garside monoid M with (quasi-)Garside element Δ, we can define the *left normal form* of an element by repeatedly extracting the $\preccurlyeq$-greatest common lower bound of the element and Δ. More precisely, the normal form of $x \in M$ is the unique word $\mathrm{NF}(x) = x_1 \,.\, x_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, x_\ell$ in $(\mathcal{D} \setminus \{\mathbf{1}\})^*$ such that $x = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_\ell$ and $x_i = \Delta \wedge x_i x_{i+1} \cdots x_\ell$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, or equivalently, $\partial x_{i-1} \wedge x_i = \mathbf{1}$ for $i = 2, \dots, \ell$. We write $x_1|x_2|\cdots|x_\ell$ for the word $x_1 \,.\, x_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, x_\ell$ together with the proposition that this word is in normal form.

If $x_1|x_2|\cdots|x_\ell$ is the normal form of $x \in M$, we define the *infimum* of x as $\inf(x) = \max\{i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\} : x_i = \Delta\}$, the *supremum* of x as $\sup(x) = \ell$, and the *canonical length* of x as $\mathrm{cl}(x) = \sup(x) - \inf(x)$. Note that $\inf(x)$ is the largest integer i such that $\Delta^i \preccurlyeq x$ holds, and $\sup(x)$ is the smallest integer i such that $x \preccurlyeq \Delta^i$ holds.

The operation ∂ can be extended to all of M by defining ∂x to be the unique element such that $x\partial x = \Delta^{\sup(x)}$. If $\mathrm{NF}(x) = x_1|x_2\cdots|x_\ell$ is the normal form of x and $\inf(x) = k$, then $\mathrm{NF}(\partial x) = \partial x_\ell|\partial^3 x_{\ell-1}|\cdots|\partial^{2(\ell-k)-1}x_{k+1}$.

Let $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_M$ be the language on the set $\mathcal{D}^\circ$ of proper simple elements consisting of all words (of finite length) in normal form, and write $\mathcal{L}^{(n)} = \mathcal{L}_M^{(n)}$ for the subset consisting of words of length n:

$$\mathcal{L} := \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{L}^{(n)} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{L}^{(n)} := \left\{x_1 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, x_n \in \left(\mathcal{D}^\circ\right)^* : \forall i,\ \partial x_i \wedge x_{i+1} = \mathbf{1}\right\}$$

We also define $\overline{\mathcal{L}} := \overline{\mathcal{L}}_M := \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(n)}$, where

$$\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(n)} := \overline{\mathcal{L}}_M^{(n)} := \left\{x_1 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, x_n \in (\mathcal{D}\setminus\{\mathbf{1}\})^* : \forall i,\ \partial x_i \wedge x_{i+1} = \mathbf{1}\right\}.$$

Definition 4. Given a (quasi-)Garside monoid M with (quasi-)Garside element Δ and an integer $k \geqslant 1$, let $M(k)$ denote the same monoid but with the (quasi-)Garside structure given by the (quasi-)Garside element Δ^k. We call $M(k)$ the *k-framing* of M.

As the partial orders $\preccurlyeq$ and $\succcurlyeq$ on M and $M(k)$ are identical, so are the lattice operations $\vee$, $\wedge$ and $\backslash$. It is obvious from the definitions that one has $\partial_{M(k)}x = \partial_M x \Delta^m$, where $m = k\left\lceil \frac{\sup(x)}{k}\right\rceil - \sup(x)$.

Lemma 5. *If M is a Garside monoid and w is a word in $M(k)$-normal form, then replacing each letter of w with the word for its M-normal form yields a word in M-normal form.*

Proof. Suppose that we have $M(k)$-simple elements $x, y \in \mathcal{D}_{M(k)}$ for which $x|y$ holds in $M(k)$, and whose M-normal forms are as follows:

$$\mathrm{NF}_M(x) = x_1|x_2|\cdots|x_k$$
$$\mathrm{NF}_M(y) = y_1|y_2|\cdots|y_k$$

It is sufficient to prove that $x_k|y_1$ in the original Garside structure of M.

Let $m = \partial_M x_k \wedge y_1$. We have that $m \preccurlyeq y_1 \preccurlyeq y$ and $m \preccurlyeq \partial_M x_k \preccurlyeq \partial_{M(k)}x$. Hence $m \preccurlyeq \partial_{M(k)}x \wedge y = \mathbf{1}$ and so $\partial_M x_k \wedge y_1 = \mathbf{1}$ as required. □

Remark. The map from Lemma 5 does not take $\mathcal{L}_{M(k)}$ to $\mathcal{L}_M$, as a proper simple element of $M(k)$ may have non-zero infimum in M.

Lemma 6. *Given a Garside monoid M and a word $x_0|x_1|\cdots|x_\ell$ in M-normal form, let $x_j = \mathbf{1}$ for $j > \ell$ and let $y_i = x_{ik}x_{ik+1}\cdots x_{(i+1)k-1}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{\ell}{k}\right\rfloor$.*

Then $y_0 \,.\, y_1 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, y_{\left\lfloor \frac{\ell}{k}\right\rfloor}$ is in $M(k)$-normal form.

Proof. One has $\Delta \wedge \partial_{M(k)} y_{i-1} \wedge y_i = \partial_M x_{ik-1} \wedge x_{ik} = \mathbf{1}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{\ell}{k}\right\rfloor$ and $x_{ik} \neq \mathbf{1}$, hence $y_i \neq \mathbf{1}$, for $i = 0, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{\ell}{k}\right\rfloor$. □

Definition 7. Let M be a Garside monoid with set of atoms $\mathcal{A}$, let δ be a balanced simple element of M, and let M_δ be the submonoid of M generated by $\{a \in \mathcal{A} : a \preccurlyeq \delta\}$.

M_δ is a *parabolic submonoid* of M, if $\{x \in M : x \preccurlyeq \delta\} = \mathcal{D} \cap M_\delta$ holds.

Proposition 8 ([God07, Lemma 2.1]). *If M is a Garside monoid and δ is a balanced simple element of M such that M_δ is a parabolic submonoid of M, then M_δ is a sublattice of M for both $\preccurlyeq$ and $\succcurlyeq$ that is closed under the operation $\backslash$ and its dual $/$ defined using $\succcurlyeq$. In particular, M_δ is a Garside monoid with Garside element δ.*

Remark. If M_δ is a parabolic submonoid of M, then for any $x \in M_\delta$, the left normal form of x in the Garside monoid M_δ coincides with the left normal form of x in the Garside monoid M.

2.2 Artin monoids

For details we refer to [BS72, Del72].

Let I be a finite set and let $C = (m_{i,j})_{i,j\in I}$ be a *Coxeter matrix*, that is, a symmetric matrix with entries $m_{i,j} = m_{j,i} \in \{2, 3, \ldots, \infty\}$ for $i \neq j \in I$ and $m_{i,i} = 2$ for $i \in I$. Associated to the pair (I, C) is the monoid $A_{(I,C)}$ generated by the elements of I subject to the relations

$$\langle i, j\rangle^{m_{i,j}} = \langle j, i\rangle^{m_{j,i}} \text{ for } i \neq j \in I \text{ with } m_{i,j} < \infty \ , \tag{1}$$

where $\langle i, j\rangle^{m_{i,j}} := \underbrace{i \cdot j \cdot i \cdot j \cdots}_{m_{i,j}\text{factors}}$.

As these relations are homogenous, all expressions of an element $x \in A_{(I,C)}$ as words in the generators I have the same length, so the length $|x|_I$ of x with respect to the generating set I is well defined.

It is convenient to represent the data (I, C) in the form of a labelled (undirected) graph with vertex set I: two vertices i and j are joined by an edge labelled $m_{i,j}$ iff $m_{i,j} > 2$, where the label 3 usually is not written explicitly.

The *Coxeter group* $W_{(I,C)}$ associated to the pair (I, C) is the group given by the quotient of the monoid $A_{(I,C)}$ by the relations $i^2 = \mathbf{1}$ for all $i \in I$. This gives a natural epimorphism $\pi_{(I,C)}$ from the monoid $A_{(I,C)}$ onto $W_{(I,C)}$.

A word $i_1 \,.\, i_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, i_k \in I^*$ is called *reduced*, if there is no word of length less than k that represents the element $i_1 \cdots i_k$ of $W_{(I,C)}$.

Lemma 9 ([BB05, Theorem 3.3.1]). *Two reduced words represent the same element of $W_{(I,C)}$ if and only if they can be related by (1). In other words, two minimum length words for the same element of $W_{(I,C)}$ must also represent the same element of $A_{(I,C)}$.*

As a consequence of the previous lemma, we have a well-defined map $r_{(I,C)}$ from $W_{(I,C)}$ to $A_{(I,C)}$ which, for each element of $W_{(I,C)}$, takes a reduced word representing the element and reinterprets it as an element of $A_{(I,C)}$. This gives a set-theoretic section of $\pi_{(I,C)}$, that is, one has $\pi_{(I,C)} \circ r_{(I,C)} = \mathrm{id}_{W_{(I,C)}}$.

The monoid $A_{(I,C)}$ is said to be *of spherical type*, if the corresponding Coxeter group $W_{(I,C)}$ is finite. In this case, $W_{(I,C)}$ has a unique longest element and lifting this element, via $r_{(I,C)}$, gives a Garside element in $A_{(I,C)}$. The Garside structure this induces is as follows: The atoms of $A_{(I,C)}$ are the elements of I. The set of simple elements is the image of $r_{(I,C)}$. (That is, an element of $A_{(I,C)}$ is simple if and only if it cannot be written as a word containing the square of a generator.) Moreover, the prefix and suffix orders on the set of simple elements correspond to the right and, respectively, left weak orders on the Coxeter

group $W_{(I,C)}$. Throughout this paper we will refer to the monoid $A_{(I,C)}$ with this particular Garside structure as the *Artin monoid of type* (I, C).

As a consequence of the simple elements being precisely those elements that do not involve the square of a generator, the Garside normal form condition can be expressed in terms of starting and finishing sets:

Theorem 10 ([Cha95, Lemma 4.2])**.** *If M is an Artin monoid of spherical type with set of atoms $\mathcal{A}$ and $s \in \mathcal{D}$, then $S(\partial s) = \mathcal{A} \setminus F(s)$.*

Corollary 11. *Suppose that M is an Artin monoid of spherical type. Then, for $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$, one has $x|y$ if and only if $F(x) \supseteq S(y)$ holds.*

Proof. We have $x|y$ if and only if $\partial x \wedge y = \mathbf{1}$. The latter is equivalent to $S(\partial x) \cap S(y) = \varnothing$, so the claim follows with Theorem 10. □

If $A_{(I,C)}$ is an Artin monoid and $J \subseteq I$, then the submonoid of $A_{(I,C)}$ generated by J is a parabolic submonoid of $A_{(I,C)}$. Indeed, it is (isomorphic to) the Artin monoid $A_{(J,C')}$, where (J, C') is the subgraph of the graph (I, C) spanned by the vertex set J.

If the graph (I, C) is connected, the Artin monoid $A_{(I,C)}$ is called *irreducible*. As generators in different connected components of the graph (I, C) commute, it is obvious that every Artin monoid can be decomposed (in a unique way) as the direct product of irreducible Artin monoids.

The classification of finite Coxeter groups yields a classification of the irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type:

Theorem 12 ([Cox35, BS72, Del72])**.** *The irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type are precisely those in the following list:*


A_n : 1 — 2 — 3 —····— n $(n \geqslant 1)$
B_n : 0 —4— 1 — 2 — 3 —····— $(n-1)$ $(n \geqslant 2)$
D_n : 0, 1, 2 — 3 — 4 —····— $(n-1)$ $(n \geqslant 3;\ \mathsf{D}_3 = \mathsf{A}_3)$
E_n : 1 — 2 — 3 (0) — 4 —····— $(n-1)$ $(n = 6, 7, 8)$
F_4 : 1 — 2 —4— 3 — 4
H_3 : 1 —5— 2 — 3
H_4 : 1 —5— 2 — 3 — 4
$\mathsf{I}_2(p)$: 1 —p— 2 $(p \geqslant 3;\ \mathsf{I}_2(3) = \mathsf{A}_2;\ \mathsf{I}_2(4) = \mathsf{B}_2)$

2.3 Penetration distance and penetration sequences

Throughout this section, let M be a Garside monoid with Garside element $\Delta = \Delta_M$, set of atoms $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_M$, and set of proper simple elements $\mathcal{D}^\circ = \mathcal{D}^\circ_M$.

In [GT14], we investigated the *penetration distance*, that is, the number of factors in the normal form of an element $x \in M$ that undergo a non-trivial change when x is multiplied on the right by an element $y \in M$:

Definition 13 ([GT14, Definition 3.2])**.** For $x, y \in M$, the *penetration distance* for the product xy is

$$\mathrm{pd}(x,y) = \mathrm{cl}(x) - \max\left\{i \in \{0,\dots,\mathrm{cl}(x)\} : x\Delta^{-\inf(x)} \wedge \Delta^i = xy\Delta^{-\inf(xy)} \wedge \Delta^i\right\}.$$

For certain probability distributions for x and y, we calculated the expected value of $\mathrm{pd}(x,y)$ by analysing the regular languages $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathrm{PSEQ} = \mathrm{PSEQ}_M = \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mathrm{PSEQ}_M^{(k)}$, where $\mathrm{PSEQ}^{(k)} = \mathrm{PSEQ}_M^{(k)}$ denotes the set of all *penetration sequences* of length k:

Definition 14 ([GT14, Definition 4.2])**.** A word $(s_k, m_k).\cdots.(s_2, m_2).(s_1, m_1)$ in $\left(\mathcal{D}^\circ \times \mathcal{D}^\circ\right)^*$ is a *penetration sequence of length* k if $m_1 \preccurlyeq \partial s_1$ holds, and if one has $s_i m_i \neq \Delta$, $\partial s_{i+1} \wedge s_i = \mathbf{1}$, and $m_{i+1} = \partial s_{i+1} \wedge s_i m_i$ for $i = 1,\dots,k-1$.

Notation 15. Observe that the regular languages $\mathcal{L}_M$, $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$ and PSEQ_M are factorial (that is, closed under taking subwords) hence, by [Shu08, Corollary 4], there exist constants $p_M, q_M, r_M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_M, \beta_M, \gamma_M \in \{0\} \cup [1, \infty[$ such that one has

$$\left|\mathrm{PSEQ}_M^{(k)}\right| \in \Theta(k^{p_M} {\alpha_M}^k)\,, \quad \left|\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}\right| \in \Theta(k^{q_M} {\beta_M}^k) \quad \text{and} \quad \left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}_M^{(k)}\right| \in \Theta(k^{r_M} {\gamma_M}^k)\,.$$

One of the key results of [GT14] was that, if $x \in \mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}$ and $y \in \mathcal{A}_M$ are chosen with uniform probability, the expected value of the penetration distance is uniformly bounded (that is, there exists a bound that is independent of k) if one has $\alpha_M < \beta_M$ [GT14, Theorem 4.7].

2.4 Zappa–Szép products

Zappa–Szép products of Garside monoids were considered in [Pic01] (there called "crossed products") and [GT16]. The notion of Zappa–Szép products generalises those of direct and semidirect products; the fundamental property being the existence of unique decompositions of the elements of a monoid as products of elements of two submonoids.

Definition 16 ([GT16, Definition 1])**.** Let M be a monoid with two submonoids G and H. We say that M is the (internal) *Zappa–Szép product* of G and H, written $M = G \bowtie H$, if for every $x \in M$ there exist unique $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and $h_1, h_2 \in H$ such that $g_1 h_1 = x = h_2 g_2$.

It was shown in [GT16] that the Zappa–Szép product $M = G \bowtie H$ admits a Garside structure if and only if both G and H do [GT16, Theorem 34, Theorem 37].

If Garside structures for M, G and H are chosen in a compatible way, then normal forms in M can be completely described in terms of normal forms in G and in H:

Definition 17 ([GT16, Definition 40])**.** The tuple $(M, G, H, \Delta_M, \Delta_G, \Delta_H)$ is a *Zappa–Szép Garside structure* if:

(a) $M = G \bowtie H$ holds;

(b) M, G and H are Garside monoids with Garside elements Δ_M, Δ_G and Δ_H, respectively; and

(c) $\Delta_M = \Delta_G \Delta_H$ holds.

Theorem 18 ([GT16, Theorem 30, Theorem 41, Corollary 55])**.** *Suppose that $(M, G, H, \Delta_M, \Delta_G, \Delta_H)$ is a Zappa–Szép Garside structure.*

Then the following hold.

1. *The map $G \times H \to M$ given by $(g, h) \mapsto g \vee h$ is a poset isomorphism $(G, \preccurlyeq_G) \times (H, \preccurlyeq_H) \to (M, \preccurlyeq_M)$.*
2. *For all $g \in G$ and $h \in H$, one has*

$$\inf_M(g \vee h) = \min(\inf_G(g), \inf_H(h))$$
$$\sup_M(g \vee h) = \max(\sup_G(g), \sup_H(h)) \,.$$

3. *The map $\psi \colon \overline{\mathcal{L}}_G \times \overline{\mathcal{L}}_H \to \overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$ given by*

$$\psi\big(g_1|g_2|\cdots|g_m \,,\, h_1|h_2|\cdots|h_n\big) = \mathrm{NF}\big((g_1 g_2 \cdots g_m) \vee (h_1 h_2 \cdots h_n)\big)$$

is a bijection.

3 Essential simple elements

Throughout this section, let M be a Garside monoid with Garside element $\Delta = \Delta_M$, set of atoms $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_M$ and set of proper simple elements $\mathcal{D}^\circ = \mathcal{D}^\circ_M$, and let $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_M$ be the set of words over the alphabet $\mathcal{D}^\circ$ that are in normal form.

By the *acceptor graph* $\Gamma = \Gamma_M$ of $\mathcal{L}$ we shall mean the labelled directed graph with vertex set $\mathcal{D}^\circ$ and, for $x, y \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$, an edge labelled y from x to y iff $\partial x \wedge y = \mathbf{1}$. Paths in this graph are in 1-to-1 correspondence with words in normal form. This graph can be made into a deterministic finite state automaton (DFA) accepting $\mathcal{L}$ by adding an initial vertex $\mathbf{1}_\Gamma$ with an edge labelled y from $\mathbf{1}_\Gamma$ to y for each $y \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$.

Definition 19. Say that a simple element $x \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ is *essential* if for all $K \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a word $x_1|x_2|\cdots|x_n \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $x = x_i$ for some $K < i < n - K$.

Let $\mathit{Ess} = \mathit{Ess}_M$ denote the set of all essential simple elements and let $\mathcal{L}_{\mathit{Ess}} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathit{Ess},M}$ be the restriction of $\mathcal{L}_M$ to essential simple elements.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathit{Ess}} := \mathcal{L}_{\mathit{Ess},M} := \mathcal{L}_M \cap \mathit{Ess}^*$$
$$\mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathit{Ess}} := \mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathit{Ess},M} := \mathcal{L}^{(k)}_M \cap \mathit{Ess}^*$$

Remark. A proper simple element is essential if and only if it is contained in a non-singleton strongly connected component of the acceptor Γ (that is, in a strongly connected component that contains at least one edge).

Example 20. In the Garside monoid $M = \langle a, b \mid aba = b^2 \rangle^+$ with Garside element $\Delta = b^3$ one has $\partial b \wedge x = b^2 \wedge x \neq \mathbf{1}$ for all proper simple elements $x \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$, whence b can only occur as the final simple factor and b^2 can only occur as the first simple factor in a word in normal form. That is, the simple elements b and b^2 are not essential.

Proposition 21. *A proper simple element $x \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ is essential if and only if its complement ∂x is essential.*

Proof. Suppose that $x \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ is essential and that we are given $K \in \mathbb{N}$. As x is essential there exists a word

$$w_n|\cdots|w_2|w_1|x|y_1|y_2|\cdots|y_m \in \mathcal{L}$$

with $n, m > K$. As for any $s, t \in \mathcal{D}$ and any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ one has $\partial s \wedge t = \mathbf{1}$ iff $\partial(\partial^{2k+1}t) \wedge \partial^{2k+3}s = \mathbf{1}$, the word

$$\partial^{-2m+1}y_m \,.\, \cdots \,.\, \partial^{-3}y_2 \,.\, \partial^{-1}y_1 \,.\, \partial x \,.\, \partial^3 w_1 \,.\, \partial^5 w_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, \partial^{2n+1}w_n$$

is also in normal form and hence lies in $\mathcal{L}$. Therefore ∂x is essential.

Applying the same argument with $\widetilde{\partial} = \partial^{-1}$, we deduce that if ∂x is essential then x is essential. □

Lemma 22. *A simple element in $M(k)$ is essential if and only if its normal form in M is a length k word of essential simple elements.*

$$\mathcal{E}ss_{M(k)} = \mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathcal{E}ss,M}$$

Proof. First we will show that the M-normal form of every $M(k)$-essential element is a length k word of M-essential elements. So suppose that $x \in \mathcal{E}ss_{M(k)}$ is $M(k)$-essential and that $\mathrm{NF}_M(x) = x_1|x_2|\cdots|x_\ell$ is the M-normal form of x. If $\ell < k$, then $\Delta \preccurlyeq \partial_{M(k)}x$ and thus $x \,.\, y$ cannot be in normal form for any non-trivial $y \in \mathcal{D}_{M(k)}$, contradicting the choice of x. Similarly, if $x_1 = \Delta$, then $y \,.\, x$ cannot be in normal form for any proper $y \in \mathcal{D}^\circ_{M(k)}$, contradicting the choice of x. Hence we have $\ell = k$ and $x_i \in \mathcal{D}^\circ_M$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

As x is essential, for every $K \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a word

$$w_{K+1}|\cdots|w_2|w_1|x|y_1|y_2|\cdots|y_{K+1} \in \mathcal{L}_{M(k)}.$$

By Lemma 5 we can replace each w_i and each y_i by their M-normal forms to produce a word in M-normal form.

$$\mathrm{NF}_M(w_i) = w_{i,1}|w_{i,2}|\cdots|w_{i,k}$$
$$\mathrm{NF}_M(y_i) = y_{i,1}|y_{i,2}|\cdots|y_{i,k}$$

As all w_i and y_i are proper $M(k)$-simple elements we have that, for $i \leqslant K$, the elements $w_{i,j}$ and $y_{i,j}$ are proper M-simple elements. Hence

$$w_{K,1}|\cdots|w_{K,k}|\cdots|w_{1,1}|\cdots|w_{1,k}|x_1|\cdots|x_k|y_{1,1}|\cdots|y_{1,k}|\cdots|y_{K,1}|\cdots|y_{K,k}$$

is a word in $\mathcal{L}_M$ and so each x_i is essential.

It remains to show that every $x_1|x_2|\cdots|x_k \in \mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathcal{E}ss,M}$ defines an $M(k)$-essential simple element. Using Lemma 6 it is clear that $x_1x_2\cdots x_k$ is a proper $M(k)$-simple element. As x_1 and x_k are essential, for any $K \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist words $w_{Kk}|\cdots|w_2|w_1 \in \mathcal{L}_M$ and $y_1|y_2|\cdots|y_{Kk} \in \mathcal{L}_M$ such that $w_1|x_1$ and $x_k|y_1$. By Lemma 6, if we let for $i = 1, \ldots, K$

$$\bar{w}_i = w_{ik}w_{ik-1}\cdots w_{(i-1)k+1}$$
$$\bar{x} = x_1x_2\cdots x_k$$
$$\bar{y}_i = y_{(i-1)k+1}y_{(i-1)k+2}\cdots y_{ik}$$

then

$$\bar{w}_K \cdot \cdots \cdot \bar{w}_2 \cdot \bar{w}_1 \cdot \bar{x} \cdot \bar{y}_1 \cdot \bar{y}_2 \cdot \cdots \cdot \bar{y}_K$$

is in $M(k)$-normal form. Moreover, because all w_i and all y_i are proper M-simple elements, we know that each letter of this word is a proper $M(k)$-simple element. Therefore this word is in $\mathcal{L}_{M(k)}$ and hence $\bar{x}$ is essential. □

Proposition 23. *If $\mathcal{Ess} = \varnothing$ then $M = \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. First note that $\mathcal{L}$ must be finite: Otherwise, there would be a word $w \in \mathcal{L}$ whose length is longer than the number of states in the automaton accepting $\mathcal{L}$ whence, by the pumping lemma, there would exist words x, y, z, where $y \neq \varepsilon$, such that $w = x \cdot y \cdot z$ and $x \cdot y \cdot \cdots \cdot y \cdot z \in \mathcal{L}$ for any number of copies of y; in particular, every letter of y would be essential in contradiction to the hypothesis.

By Lemma 22, if $\mathcal{Ess}_M$ is empty then $\mathcal{Ess}_{M(k)}$ is empty for all k. Hence, passing to $M(k)$, where k is the length of the longest word contained in $\mathcal{L}$, we may assume that all the words in $\mathcal{L}$ have length 1.

For every $s \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ and every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $sa \in \mathcal{D}$, as otherwise, $s|a$ would be a word of length 2 in $\mathcal{L}$. Choosing any $\preccurlyeq$–maximal element $s \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$, we have $sa = \Delta$ for all atoms $a \in \mathcal{A}$, hence, by cancellativity, all the atoms must be equal. In other words there is a single atom and so $M = \mathbb{N}$. □

Proposition 24. *If $\mathcal{Ess} \neq \varnothing$ then $|\mathcal{Ess}| > 1$.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{Ess} = \{s\}$.

As s is essential there exist arbitrarily long words containing s. So there is a word $w \in \mathcal{L}$ whose length is longer than the number of states in the automaton accepting $\mathcal{L}$ hence, by the pumping lemma, there exist words x, y, z, where $y \neq \varepsilon$, such that $w = x \cdot y \cdot z$ and $x \cdot y \cdot \cdots \cdot y \cdot z \in \mathcal{L}$ for any number of copies of y.

This means that every letter of y is essential. Therefore y is a positive power of s and so $s|s$, that is, $\partial s \wedge s = \mathbf{1}$.

By Proposition 21, ∂s is essential, hence $\partial s = s$. Therefore, $\partial s \wedge s = s$, which is a contradiction. □

Definition 25. Say that the language $\mathcal{L}$, or simply M, is *essentially k-transitive* if $\mathcal{Ess} \neq \varnothing$ and for all $x, y \in \mathcal{Ess}$ there exists a word of length less than or equal to $k+1$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Ess}}$ which starts with x and ends with y.

Say that $\mathcal{L}$ is essentially transitive if it is essentially k-transitive for some k.

Remark. The language $\mathcal{L}$ is essentially transitive if and only if the acceptor graph Γ has exactly one non-singleton strongly connected component (that is, exactly one strongly connected component containing at least one edge).

In this case, the language $\mathcal{L}$ is essentially k-transitive iff the diameter of the non-singleton strongly connected component of Γ is at most k.

Proposition 21 implies that if the language $\mathcal{L}$ is essentially k-transitive, then one has $k \geqslant 2$.

Example 26. The monoid $M = \langle a, b, c \mid ab = c^2, bc = a^2, ca = b^2 \rangle$ is a Garside monoid with Garside element $\Delta = a^3 = b^3 = c^3 = abc = bca = cab$. The lattice of simple elements and the acceptor for the language $\mathcal{L}_M$ are shown in Figure 1.

Every proper simple element of M is essential, but M is not essentially transitive.



Figure 1: The lattice of simple elements and the acceptor for the regular language of words in normal form for the monoid from Example 26; the strongly connected components of the acceptor are coloured.

Proposition 27. *For any pair of Garside monoids G and H, each containing at least one proper simple element, their free product amalgamated over their Garside elements, $G *_{\Delta_G=\Delta_H} H$, is a Garside monoid with Garside element $\Delta_G = \Delta_H$ for which every proper simple element is essential and whose language of normal forms is essentially 2-transitive.*

Proof. The amalgamated product $G *_{\Delta_G=\Delta_H} H$ is a Garside monoid [DP99, Prop. 5.3][Fro07] whose set of proper simple elements is the disjoint union of the proper simple elements of G and H.

Now consider $u, v \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$. If u and v lie in different factors then $u|v$ is in normal form. If u and v lie in the same factor, then choosing any proper simple element w from the other factor yields a word $u|w|v$ that is in normal form. □

Lemma 28. *If the language of normal forms of $M(k)$ is essentially transitive then the language of normal forms of M is essentially transitive*

Proof. As $\mathcal{E}ss_{M(k)} \neq \varnothing$, we have $\mathcal{E}ss_M \neq \varnothing$ by Lemma 22. Let $x, y \in \mathcal{E}ss_M$. Since x and y are essential, there exist elements $x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}$ and $y_2, \ldots, y_k$ in $\mathcal{E}ss_M$ such that $x_1 \cdot \cdots \cdot x_{k-1} \cdot x$ and $y \cdot y_2 \cdot \cdots \cdot y_k$ are in normal form. By Lemma 22, $\bar{x} = x_1 \cdots x_{k-1} x$ and $\bar{y} = y y_2 \cdots y_k$ are elements of $\mathcal{E}ss_{M(k)}$. Now as the language of normal forms in $M(k)$ is essentially transitive, we can find a path connecting $\bar{x}$ to $\bar{y}$ and then, by Lemma 5, taking the M-normal form of each letter gives a path in Γ_M from x to y. □

Remark. The converse of Lemma 28 does not hold. For example, consider the monoid $M = \langle a, b \mid a^2 = b^2 \rangle^+$ (see Example 32). M is essentially transitive, but $M(2)$ is not: We have $\mathcal{E}ss_M = \{a, b\}$ and $a|b$ as well as $b|a$. However, $\mathcal{E}ss_{M(2)} = \{ab, ba\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{M(2)} = (ab)^* \cup (ba)^*$.

Lemma 29. *If the language of normal forms of M is essentially transitive then for all k_0 there exists $k \geqslant k_0$ such that the language of normal forms of $M(k)$ is essentially transitive.*

Proof. First note that $M(k)$ is essentially transitive if and only if for each pair x, y of M-essential elements there exists a path $x|x_1|x_2|\cdots|x_\ell|y$ such that ℓ is a multiple of k.

For each pair x, y of M-essential elements choose $z \in \mathcal{E}ss_M$ together with paths $x|x_1|x_2|\cdots|x_\ell|z$, $z|z_1|z_2|\cdots|z_m|z$ and $z|y_1|y_2|\cdots|y_n|y$.

As the set of essential elements is finite, we can choose an integer $k \geqslant k_0$ such that, for each pair x, y the integer m is coprime to k. Then for each pair x, y there exists p such that $\ell + pm + n = 0 \mod k$. □

Definition 30. For an integer $k > 0$, a word $x_1|\cdots|x_k \in \mathcal{L}^{(k)}$ is called *rigid*, if the word $x_k|x_1$ is in normal form. Let $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathcal{R}ig}$ denote the set of rigid words in $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}$.

Theorem 31 ([Car13, Proposition 4.1])**.** *If the language $\mathcal{L}$ is essentially transitive then, for sufficiently large ℓ, the proportion of rigid elements in the ball of radius ℓ, that is in $\bigcup_{k\leqslant\ell}\mathcal{L}^{(k)}$, is bounded below by a positive constant.*

Proof. A word $x_1|\cdots|x_k \in \mathcal{L}$ is rigid if and only if the word $x_1|\cdots|x_k \,.\, x_1$ is in normal form, that is, traces out a cycle in Γ.

Assume that the language $\mathcal{L}$ is essentially D-transitive. Then, for any word $w = x_1|\cdots|x_\ell \in \mathcal{L}^{(\ell)}_{\mathcal{E}ss}$, there exist an integer $c < D$ and $x_{\ell+1}, \ldots, x_{\ell+c} \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ such that $x_1|\cdots|x_\ell|x_{\ell+1}|\cdots|x_{\ell+c}|x_1 \in \mathcal{L}^{(\ell)}$. Hence, any $w \in \mathcal{L}^{(\ell)}_{\mathcal{E}ss}$ can be extended to a rigid word $w' \in \mathcal{L}^{(\ell')}_{\mathcal{R}ig}$ for some $\ell' \in \{\ell, \ldots, \ell + D - 1\}$. For fixed ℓ, the map $w \mapsto w'$ is clearly injective, so we have $\left|\bigcup_{k=\ell}^{\ell+D-1}\mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathcal{R}ig}\right| \geqslant \left|\mathcal{L}^{(\ell)}_{\mathcal{E}ss}\right|$.

Now let $a_d := \left|\bigcup_{k=(d-1)D+1}^{dD}\mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathcal{R}ig}\right|$ and $b_d := \left|\bigcup_{k=(d-1)D+1}^{dD}\mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathcal{E}ss}\right|$. The language $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}ss}$ is factorial and, as there are essential elements, infinite. Thus, by [Shu08, Corollary 4], we have $\left|\mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathcal{E}ss}\right| \in \Theta(k^{q'}\beta'^k)$ with $\beta' \geqslant 1$. In particular, $a_d, b_d \geqslant 1$ holds for all values of d. Moreover, as $\sum_{k=\ell}^{\ell+D-1} k^{q'}\beta'^k \in \Theta\big(\ell^{q'}\beta'^\ell\big)$, we have $\Theta(a_d) = \Theta(b_d) = \Theta(b_{d+1}) = \Theta\big(d^{q'}\beta'^{dD}\big)$. Hence, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that we have $a_d > \frac{1}{C}b_d$ and $b_{d+1} < Cb_d$ for sufficiently large d. Hence,

$$\frac{\left|\bigcup_{k=0}^{\ell}\mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathcal{R}ig}\right|}{\left|\bigcup_{k=0}^{\ell}\mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathcal{E}ss}\right|} \geqslant \frac{a_1 + \cdots + a_{\lfloor\frac{\ell}{D}\rfloor}}{1 + b_1 + \cdots + b_{\lfloor\frac{\ell}{D}\rfloor} + b_{\lfloor\frac{\ell}{D}\rfloor+1}} > \frac{1}{2C^2}$$

holds for sufficiently large ℓ.

So it remains to show that there exists a constant K' such that, for sufficiently large ℓ, one has $\left|\bigcup_{k=0}^{\ell}\mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathcal{E}ss}\right| \geqslant \frac{1}{K'}\left|\bigcup_{k=0}^{\ell}\mathcal{L}^{(k)}\right|$.

For $w = x_1|\cdots|x_\ell$, let $\alpha(w)$ be the minimal integer satisfying $x_{\alpha(w)} \in \mathcal{E}ss$, or 0 if no such integer exists. Similarly, let $\omega(w)$ be the maximal integer satisfying $x_{\omega(w)} \in \mathcal{E}ss$, or 0 if no such integer exists. Clearly, if $\alpha(w) > 0$ and $\omega(w) > 0$ hold, then one has $x_{\alpha(w)}|\cdots|x_{\omega(w)} \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}ss}$. By the pumping lemma, $\alpha(w) > 0$ and $\omega(w) > 0$ hold for all but a finite number $\widetilde{K}$ of words w. Moreover, there exists a constant K such that for any $x \in \mathcal{E}ss$ both, the number of words $y_1|\cdots|y_r$ such that $y_1, \ldots, y_r \in \mathcal{D}^\circ \setminus \mathcal{E}ss$ and $y_r|x$ hold,



Figure 2: The lattice of simple elements and the acceptor for the regular language of words in normal form for the monoid from Example 32.

and the number of words $z_1|\cdots|z_s$ such that $z_1,\ldots,z_s \in \mathcal{D}^\circ \setminus \mathcal{E}ss$ and $x|z_1$ hold, are bounded above by K. Hence, for words w satisfying $\alpha(w) > 0$ and $\omega(w) > 0$, the map $x_1|\cdots|x_\ell \mapsto x_{\alpha(w)}|\cdots|x_{\omega(w)}$ is at most K^2-to-1. Thus, one has $\left|\bigcup_{k=0}^{\ell} \mathcal{L}^{(k)}\right| \leqslant \widetilde{K} + K^2 \left|\bigcup_{k=0}^{\ell} \mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathcal{E}ss}\right|$, proving the claim. □

Example 32. Under the hypotheses of Theorem 31, it is not necessarily true that the percentage of rigid elements in $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}$ is bounded below by a positive constant for sufficiently large values of k. In other words, it is possible for the sphere of radius k to contain an arbitrarily small proportion of rigid elements.

As an example, consider the monoid $M = \langle a, b \mid a^2 = b^2 \rangle^+$ with Garside element $\Delta = a^2 = b^2$; see Figure 2. Clearly, the language $\mathcal{L}_M$ is essentially transitive. (And, moreover, every proper simple element is essential.) However, for odd $k = 2m+1$, one has $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}_M = \{a\,.\,(b\,.\,a)^m, b\,.\,(a\,.\,b)^m\}$, and so there are no rigid elements of length k.

Being essentially transitive is a rather strong property. In particular, it implies that the monoid in question cannot be decomposed as a Zappa–Szép product. As we shall see in Example 37, the converse of this does not hold, i.e. not all monoids that are $\bowtie$-indecomposable are essentially transitive.

Proposition 33. *If $M = G \bowtie H$ for two submonoids G and H, then M is not essentially transitive.*

Proof. By [GT16, Theorem 34], G and H are parabolic submonoids of K. The corresponding Garside elements Δ_G of G and Δ_H of H are proper simple elements of K. Moreover, these elements are essential, as the words $\Delta_G\,.\,\cdots\,.\,\Delta_G$ and $\Delta_H\,.\,\cdots\,.\,\Delta_H$ are in normal form for any number of copies of Δ_G respectively Δ_H. Yet, by [GT16, Corollary 48], there cannot be a normal form word connecting Δ_G to Δ_H. □

Definition 34. For $y \in M$, let $\Delta_y := \bigvee\{x \backslash y : x \in M\}$. The monoid M is called Δ-*pure* if $\Delta_a = \Delta_b$ holds for any $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$.

Theorem 35 ([Pic01, Proposition 4.7][GT16, Theorem 39])**.** *A Garside monoid M is Δ-pure if and only if it is $\bowtie$-indecomposable.*

Corollary 36. *If M is essentially transitive then it is Δ-pure.*

Proof. The claim follows with Proposition 33 and Theorem 35. □



Hasse diagram

Γ

Figure 3: The lattice of simple elements and the acceptor for the regular language of words in normal form for the monoid from Example 37.

The following example shows that there exists a Garside monoid that is Δ-pure, hence $\bowtie$-indecomposable, but not essentially transitive, that is, that the converses to Proposition 33 and Corollary 36 do not hold.

Example 37. Consider the monoid $M = \langle a, b \mid a^2 = b^2 \rangle^+$ with Garside element $\Delta = a^4$. The lattice of simple elements and the acceptor for the regular language of words in normal form are shown in Figure 3.

We see that ab and ba are essential elements that are in different strongly connected components of Γ, and so $\mathcal{L}$ is not essentially transitive.

Now consider $\Delta_a = \bigvee\{x\backslash a : x \in M\}$. If x has a as a prefix then $x\backslash a = \mathbf{1}$, so we can restrict our attention to elements which do not have a as a prefix. This means that $x = (ba)^k$ or $x = (ba)^k b$ for some k. In the first case $(ba)^k \vee a = (ba)^k a$, so $x\backslash a = a$. In the second case $(ba)^k b \vee a = (ba)^k b^2$, so $x\backslash a = b$. Therefore $\Delta_a = a \vee b = a^2$. Similarly, $\Delta_b = a^2$. Hence M is Δ-pure, and thus $\bowtie$-indecomposable.

4 Growth rates

Throughout this section, let M be a Garside monoid with Garside element Δ, set of atoms $\mathcal{A}$ and set of proper simple elements $\mathcal{D}^\circ = \mathrm{Div}(\Delta) \setminus \{\mathbf{1}, \Delta\}$. Recall that α_M is the exponential growth rate of the regular language $\textsc{Pseq}_M$ and that β_M is the exponential growth rate of the regular language $\mathcal{L}_M$.

The main aim of this section is to show that $\alpha_M < \beta_M$ holds if the language $\mathcal{L}_M$ is essentially transitive and every element of $\mathcal{D}^\circ$ is essential. In particular, by [GT14, Theorem 4.7], the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_k \times \mu_\mathcal{A}}[\mathrm{pd}]$ of the penetration distance $\mathrm{pd}(x, a)$ is in this case bounded independently of k, where ν_k is the uniform distribution on $\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}$ and $\mu_\mathcal{A}$ is the uniform distribution on the set $\mathcal{A}$.

Moreover, we will show that the expectation of the penetration distance $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_k \times \mu_\mathcal{A}}[\mathrm{pd}]$, with ν_k and $\mu_\mathcal{A}$ as above, diverges if $(M, G, H, \Delta_M, \Delta_G, \Delta_H)$ is a Zappa–Szép Garside structure such that $\beta_G, \beta_H > 1$ holds and at least one of the factors has the property that its language of normal forms is essentially transitive and all proper simple elements are essential.

Theorem 38. *If every proper simple element of M is essential and the language $\mathcal{L}_M$ of normal forms is essentially transitive, then one has $\alpha_M < \beta_M$.*

Proof. As there is only one monoid, we drop the subscript M.

Consider the acceptor Γ of $\mathcal{L} \subseteq (\mathcal{D}^\circ)^*$, whose adjacency matrix is given by

$$\Gamma_{s_1,s_2} = \begin{cases} 1 & \partial s_2 \wedge s_1 = \mathbf{1} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$. The growth rate β of $\mathcal{L}$ is the Perron–Frobenius eigenvalue of the non-negative matrix $(\Gamma_{s_1,s_2})_{s_1,s_2\in\mathcal{D}^\circ}$. Let $x = (x_s)_{s\in\mathcal{D}^\circ}$ be an eigenvector for the eigenvalue β of Γ.

The acceptor Π of PSEQ $\subseteq \mathcal{P}^*$, where $\mathcal{P} = \{(s,m) \in \mathcal{D}^\circ \times \mathcal{D}^\circ : sm \preccurlyeq \Delta\}$, has the adjacency matrix given by

$$\Pi_{(s_1,m_1),(s_2,m_2)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \partial s_2 \wedge s_1 = \mathbf{1} \text{ and } s_1 m_1 \neq \Delta \text{ and } m_2 = \partial s_2 \wedge s_1 m_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $(s_1,m_1),(s_2,m_2) \in \mathcal{P}$. The growth rate α of PSEQ is the Perron–Frobenius eigenvalue of the non-negative matrix $\big(\Pi_{(s_1,m_1),(s_2,m_2)}\big)_{(s_1,m_1),(s_2,m_2)\in\mathcal{P}}$, whence one has

$$\alpha = \inf_{z\in(\mathbb{R}^+)^{\mathcal{P}}} \max_{t\in\mathcal{P}} \frac{(\Pi z)_t}{z_t}$$

by [TW89, Theorem 3.1]. In order to prove the theorem, it is thus sufficient to construct a vector $y = (y_t)_{t\in\mathcal{P}}$ such that, for any $t \in \mathcal{P}$, one has $y_t > 0$ and $(\Pi y)_t < \beta y_t$.

To do this, consider $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}} = \{(s,m) \in \mathcal{D}^\circ \times (\mathcal{D}^\circ \cup \{\mathbf{1}\}) : sm \preccurlyeq \Delta\}$, and define a directed graph $\widetilde{\Pi}$ with vertex set $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ via its adjacency matrix given by

$$\widetilde{\Pi}_{(s_1,m_1),(s_2,m_2)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \partial s_2 \wedge s_1 = \mathbf{1} \text{ and } m_2 = \partial s_2 \wedge s_1 m_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $(s_1,m_1),(s_2,m_2) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$. Observe that $\widetilde{\Pi}$ has Π as a subgraph and that, locally, $\widetilde{\Pi}$ resembles the graph Γ: The edges ending in the vertex $(s_1,m_1) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ of $\widetilde{\Pi}$ are in bijection to the edges ending in the vertex s_1 of Γ. More precisely, for given $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ and $m_1 \in \mathcal{D}^\circ \cup \{\mathbf{1}\}$, there exists an $m_2 \in \mathcal{D}^\circ \cup \{\mathbf{1}\}$ such that there is an edge $(s_2,m_2) \to (s_1,m_1)$ in $\widetilde{\Pi}$, if and only if there is an edge $s_2 \to s_1$ in Γ, and if so, $m_2 = \partial s_2 \wedge s_1 m_1$ is uniquely determined, that is, there exists exactly one such edge. (See Figure 4 and Figure 5.)

Now define a vector $y = (y_t)_{t\in\mathcal{P}}$ by setting $y_{(s,m)} = x_s$ for $(s,m) \in \mathcal{P}$ and a vector $\widetilde{y} = (\widetilde{y}_t)_{t\in\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}}$ by setting $\widetilde{y}_{(s,m)} = x_s$ for $(s,m) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$.

Clearly, $\widetilde{y}$ is an eigenvector to the eigenvalue β of $\widetilde{\Pi}$:

$$(\widetilde{\Pi}\widetilde{y})_{(s_1,m_1)} = \sum_{\substack{(s_2,m_2)\in\widetilde{\mathcal{P}} \\ \partial s_2 \wedge s_1 = \mathbf{1} \\ m_2 = \partial s_2 \wedge s_1 m_1}} \widetilde{y}_{(s_2,m_2)} = \sum_{\substack{s_2\in\mathcal{D}^\circ \\ \partial s_2 \wedge s_1 = \mathbf{1}}} x_{s_2} = (\Gamma x)_{s_1} = \beta \cdot x_{s_1} = \beta \cdot \widetilde{y}_{(s_1,m_1)}.$$

So it remains to show that for $t \in \mathcal{P} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ one has $y_t > 0$ and $(\Pi y)_t < (\widetilde{\Pi}\widetilde{y})_t$.



Hasse diagram $\quad \Gamma \quad \Pi \quad \widetilde{\Pi} \smallsetminus \Pi$

Figure 4: Lattice of simple elements and digraphs Γ, Π and $\widetilde{\Pi}$ for the monoid $M = \langle a, b \mid a^2 = b^2 \rangle^+$. Vertices and edges in red are contained in $\widetilde{\Pi} \smallsetminus \Pi$. (That is, the digraph Π consists of the vertices (a, a), and (b, b) without any edges.)



Hasse diagram $\quad \Gamma \quad \Pi \quad \widetilde{\Pi} \smallsetminus \Pi$

Figure 5: Lattice of simple elements and digraphs Γ, Π and $\widetilde{\Pi}$ for the monoid $M = \langle a, b \mid aba = bab \rangle^+$. Vertices and edges in red are contained in $\widetilde{\Pi} \smallsetminus \Pi$. (That is, the digraph Π consists of the vertices (a, b), (b, a), (b, ab), (a, ba), (ab, a) and (ba, b) without any edges.) To reduce clutter, the edge labels in the acceptor graphs were suppressed.

Claim. For $(s,m) \in \mathcal{P} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ one has $y_{(s,m)} > 0$.

As every $s \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ is essential and $\mathcal{L}$ is essentially transitive, for any $s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ there exists a positive integer ℓ such that $(\Gamma^\ell)_{s_1,s_2} > 0$, whence $x_{s_2} > 0$ implies $(\Gamma^\ell x)_{s_1} > 0$, as Γ and x are non-negative. As x is an eigenvector of Γ and $x_{s_2} > 0$ must hold for at least one $s_2 \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$, we have $x_{s_1} > 0$ for every $s_1 \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ and thus $y_{(s,m)} = x_s > 0$ for every $(s,m) \in \mathcal{P}$, showing the claim.

Claim. For $(s,m) \in \mathcal{P} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ one has $(\Pi y)_{(s_1,m_1)} < (\widetilde{\Pi}\widetilde{y})_{(s_1,m_1)}$.

We obtain Π from $\widetilde{\Pi}$ by 1.) removing all edges ending in (s_1,m_1) if $m_1 = \mathbf{1}$ or $s_1 m_1 = \Delta$; and 2.) removing the edge $(s_2,m_2) \to (s_1,m_1)$ if $m_2 = \mathbf{1}$.

So it is sufficient to show that for all $(s_1,m_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $s_1 m_1 \neq \Delta$, there exists $s_2 \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ such that $\partial s_2 \wedge s_1 m_1 = \mathbf{1}$ and $y_{(s_2,m_2)} = x_{s_2} > 0$. The latter holds as all proper simple elements are essential, and thus $s_1 m_1 \neq \Delta$ implies the existence of an essential s_2 such that $s_2 | s_1 m_1$, and since $x_{s_2} > 0$ holds. □

Remark. Theorem 38 shows that the hypotheses of [GT14, Theorem 4.8] cannot be satisfied.

Corollary 39. *Assume that every proper simple element of M is essential and that the language $\mathcal{L}_M$ of normal forms is essentially transitive, let ν_k be the uniform probability measure on $\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}$, and let $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the uniform probability distribution on the set $\mathcal{A}$ of atoms of M.*

The expected value $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_k \times \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}[\mathrm{pd}]$ of the penetration distance with respect to $\nu_k \times \mu_{\mathcal{A}}$ is uniformly bounded (that is, bounded independently of k).

Proof. The claim follows with Theorem 38 and [GT14, Theorem 4.7]. □

We now turn to the analysis of growth rates of Zappa–Szép products with respect to a Zappa–Szép Garside structure.

Lemma 40. *For $c > 1$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the following hold:*

1. *One has $\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} j^m c^j \in \Theta(k^m c^k)$.*
2. *One has $\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} j^m \in \Theta(k^{m+1})$.*

Proof. The second claim holds by Bernoulli's formula [GKP94, p. 283]. For the first claim, observe that for any $k \geqslant 2$ one has

$$\frac{1}{2^m c} \leqslant \frac{1}{k^m c^k}(k-1)^m c^{k-1} \leqslant \frac{1}{k^m c^k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} j^m c^j < \sum_{j=1}^{k} c^{-j} < \frac{1}{c-1} .$$

□

Lemma 41. *Using Notation 15, the following hold:*

1. *One has $\beta_M = 0$ if and only if $\gamma_M = 1$ and $r_M = 0$ hold.*
2. *One has $\beta_M = 1$ if and only if $\gamma_M = 1$ and $r_M \geqslant 1$ hold. Moreover, in this case, one has $q_M = r_M - 1$.*
3. *One has $\beta_M > 1$ if and only if $\gamma_M > 1$ holds. Moreover, in this case, one has $\beta_M = \gamma_M$ and $q_M = r_M$.*

Proof. As $\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)} = \bigsqcup_{j=0}^{k} \Delta^{k-j}\mathcal{L}^{(j)}$ holds, one has $\left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}\right| = \sum_{j=0}^{k} \left|\mathcal{L}^{(j)}\right|$. Firstly observe that $\beta_M = 0$ holds if and only if one has $\left|\mathcal{L}^{(k)}\right| = 0$ for sufficiently large k. The latter happens if and only if $\left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}\right|$ is eventually constant, which is equivalent to $\gamma_M = 1$ and $r_M = 0$. So the first claim is shown.

Using Notation 15 and Lemma 40, we obtain

$$k^{r_M}{\gamma_M}^k \in \Theta\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k} j^{q_M}{\beta_M}^j\right) = \begin{cases} \Theta\left(k^{q_M}{\beta_M}^k\right) & \text{if } \beta_M > 1 \\ \Theta\left(k^{q_M+1}\right) & \text{if } \beta_M = 1\,, \end{cases}$$

which implies the remaining claims. □

Proposition 42. *Assume that $(M, G, H, \Delta_M, \Delta_G, \Delta_H)$ is a Zappa–Szép Garside structure, let β_M, γ_M and q_M, r_M be as in Notation 15, and let $\beta_G, \gamma_G, \beta_H, \gamma_H \in \{0\} \cup [1, \infty[$ and $q_G, r_G, q_H, r_H \in \mathbb{N}$ be the corresponding constants for G respectively H.*

The following table gives $\beta_M, \gamma_M, q_M, r_M$ in terms of $\beta_G, \gamma_G, \beta_H, \gamma_H$ and q_G, r_G, q_H, r_H:

	$\beta_H = 0$ $\gamma_H = 1$ $r_H = 0$	$\beta_H = 1$ $\gamma_H = 1$ $r_H = q_H + 1$	$\beta_H > 1$ $\gamma_H = \beta_H$ $r_H = q_H$
$\beta_G = 0$ $\gamma_G = 1$ $r_G = 0$	$\beta_M = 1$ $q_M = 0$ $\gamma_M = 1$ $r_M = 1$	$\beta_M = 1$ $q_M = q_H + 1$ $\gamma_M = 1$ $r_M = r_H + 1$	$\beta_M = \beta_H$ $q_M = q_H + 1$ $\gamma_M = \gamma_H$ $r_M = r_H + 1$
$\beta_G = 1$ $\gamma_G = 1$ $r_G = q_G + 1$	$\beta_M = 1$ $q_M = q_G + 1$ $\gamma_M = 1$ $r_M = r_G + 1$	$\beta_M = 1$ $q_M = q_G + q_H + 2$ $\gamma_M = 1$ $r_M = r_G + r_H + 1$	$\beta_M = \beta_H$ $q_M = q_G + q_H + 2$ $\gamma_M = \gamma_H$ $r_M = r_G + r_H + 1$
$\beta_G > 1$ $\gamma_G = \beta_G$ $r_G = q_G$	$\beta_M = \beta_G$ $q_M = q_G + 1$ $\gamma_M = \gamma_G$ $r_M = r_G + 1$	$\beta_M = \beta_G$ $q_M = q_G + q_H + 2$ $\gamma_M = \gamma_G$ $r_M = r_G + r_H + 1$	$\beta_M = \beta_G\beta_H$ $q_M = q_G + q_H$ $\gamma_M = \gamma_G\gamma_H$ $r_M = r_G + r_H$

Proof. First note that, by Lemma 41, the cases in the table are correct and exhaustive.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ consider any $x \in M$ with $\mathrm{NF}(x) \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}_M^{(k)}$. By Theorem 18, there exist unique elements $g_x \in G$ and $h_x \in H$ such that $x = g_x \vee h_x$, and moreover, $\mathrm{NF}(g_x) \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}_G^{(k_G)}$ and $\mathrm{NF}(h_x) \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}_H^{(k_H)}$ with $k = \max\{k_G, k_H\}$.

Indeed, the map

$$\mathrm{NF}(x) \mapsto \big(\mathrm{NF}(g_x), \mathrm{NF}(h_x)\big)$$

is a bijection from $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$ to $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_G \times \overline{\mathcal{L}}_H$ by Theorem 18, whence one has

$$\left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}_M^{(k)}\right| = \left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}_G^{(k)}\right| \cdot \left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}_H^{(k)}\right| + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}_G^{(k)}\right| \cdot \left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}_H^{(j)}\right| + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}_G^{(j)}\right| \cdot \left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}_H^{(k)}\right|$$

and thus

$$k^{r_M}{\gamma_M}^k \in \Theta\Bigg(k^{r_G}{\gamma_G}^k k^{r_H}{\gamma_H}^k + k^{r_G}{\gamma_G}^k\Bigg(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} j^{r_H}{\gamma_H}^j\Bigg) + \Bigg(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} j^{r_G}{\gamma_G}^j\Bigg)k^{r_H}{\gamma_H}^k\Bigg) .$$

The claimed equalities for γ_M and r_M are easily verified using Lemma 40, and the claimed equalities for β_M and q_M then follow with Lemma 41. □

Corollary 43. *Assume that $(M, G, H, \Delta_M, \Delta_G, \Delta_H)$ is a Zappa–Szép Garside structure, and let β_G and β_H be the exponential growth rates of the regular languages $\mathcal{L}_G$ respectively $\mathcal{L}_H$.*

Then $\big|\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}\big| \in \Theta\Big(\big|\mathcal{L}_G^{(k)}\big| \cdot \big|\mathcal{L}_H^{(k)}\big|\Big)$ holds if and only if $\beta_G > 1$ and $\beta_H > 1$.

Proof. Using Notation 15, $\big|\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}\big| \in \Theta\Big(\big|\mathcal{L}_G^{(k)}\big| \cdot \big|\mathcal{L}_H^{(k)}\big|\Big)$ is equivalent to $\beta_M = \beta_G\beta_H$ and $q_M = q_G + q_H$. The claim then follows with Proposition 42. □

Notation 44. Assume that $(M, G, H, \Delta_M, \Delta_G, \Delta_H)$ is a Zappa–Szép Garside structure. Given $g = g_1|\cdots|g_k \in \mathcal{L}_G^{(k)}$ and $h = h_1|\cdots|h_k \in \mathcal{L}_H^{(k)}$, consider the normal form $g'_1h'_1|\cdots|g'_kh'_k \in \mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}$ of $g_1\cdots g_k \vee h_1\cdots h_k$, and define

$$\pi_{g,h} := (g'_1h'_1, m_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot (g'_kh'_k, m_k) ,$$

where $m_k = \partial_H(h'_k)$ (that is, $h'_km_k = \Delta_H$) and $m_i = \partial_M(g'_ih'_i) \wedge_M g'_{i+1}h'_{i+1}m_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$.

Lemma 45. *In the situation of Notation 44, one has $\pi_{g,h} \in \mathrm{PSEQ}_M^{(k)}$.*

Proof. Using [GT16, Lemma 42], we have $\Delta_H \preccurlyeq g'_ih'_im_i \neq \Delta_M$ and $m_i \neq \mathbf{1}$ for all i by induction, so $\pi_{g,h} \in \mathrm{PSEQ}_M^{(k)}$. □

Proposition 46. *Assume that $(M, G, H, \Delta_M, \Delta_G, \Delta_H)$ is a Zappa–Szép Garside structure, let α_M, β_M and p_M, q_M be as in Notation 15, and let $\alpha_G, \beta_G, \alpha_H, \beta_H \in \{0\} \cup [1, \infty[$ and $p_G, q_G, p_H, q_H \in \mathbb{N}$ the corresponding constants for G respectively H.*

Then one has the following:

1. *If one has $\beta_G, \beta_H > 0$, then $\alpha_M = \beta_M$ holds.*
2. *If $\beta_G, \beta_H > 1$, then $\alpha_M = \beta_M$ and $p_M = q_M$ hold.*

Proof. By Lemma 45, we have a map $\mathcal{L}_G^{(k)} \times \mathcal{L}_H^{(k)} \to \mathrm{PSEQ}_M^{(k)}$ given by the assignment $(g, h) \mapsto \pi_{g,h}$. This map is injective by Theorem 18, so we have $\big|\mathrm{PSEQ}_M^{(k)}\big| \geqslant \big|\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}\big| \cdot \big|\mathcal{L}_N^{(k)}\big|$. Thus $k^{q_G+q_H}(\beta_G\beta_H)^k \in O(k^{p_M}\alpha_M{}^k) \subseteq O(k^{q_M}\beta_M{}^k)$, where the final inclusion holds by [GT14, Corollary 4.4].

If $\beta_G, \beta_H > 0$, then we have $\beta_M = \beta_G\beta_H$ by Proposition 42, and thus obtain $\alpha_M = \beta_M$. Similarly, if $\beta_G, \beta_H > 1$, then we have $\beta_M = \beta_G\beta_H$ and $q_M = q_G + q_H$ by Proposition 42, and thus obtain $\alpha_M = \beta_M$ and $p_M = q_M$. □

Notation 47. Assume that M is a Garside monoid with set of proper simple elements $\mathcal{D}^\circ$. For $s \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ and $k \geqslant 1$, we define

$$\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}(s) := \mathcal{L}_M^{(k)} \cap (\mathcal{D}^\circ)^* \,.\, s = \left\{ s_1 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, s_k \in \mathcal{L}_M^{(k)} : s_k = s \right\} .$$

Lemma 48 ([GT14, Lemma 4.10])**.** *If M is a Garside monoid such that all proper simple elements of M are essential and the language $\mathcal{L}_M$ is essentially transitive, then one has $\left|\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}(s)\right| \in \Theta\Big(\left|\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}\right|\Big)$ for all $s \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$.*

Theorem 49. *Assume that $(M, G, H, \Delta_M, \Delta_G, \Delta_H)$ is a Zappa–Szép Garside structure, that all proper simple elements of H are essential, that the language $\mathcal{L}_H$ is essentially transitive, and that the exponential growth rates β_G of $\mathcal{L}_G$ and β_H of $\mathcal{L}_H$ satisfy $\beta_G, \beta_H > 1$.*

If ν_k is the uniform probability measure on $\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}$ and $\mu_\mathcal{A}$ is the uniform probability distribution on the set $\mathcal{A}$ of atoms of M, then the expected value $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_k \times \mu_\mathcal{A}}[\mathrm{pd}]$ diverges, that is, one has $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\nu_k \times \mu_\mathcal{A}}[\mathrm{pd}] = \infty$.

Proof. For any atom $a \in \mathcal{A} \cap H$, any $g \in \mathcal{L}_G^{(k)}$ and any $h \in \mathcal{L}_H^{(k)}(\widetilde{\partial}_H a)$, the sequence $\pi_{g,h}$ defined in Notation 44 is a penetration sequence establishing $\mathrm{pd}(x_{(g,h)}, a) \geqslant k$ for some $x_{(g,h)} \in M$. Moreover, the map $(g,h) \mapsto x_{(g,h)}$ is injective.

Using Lemma 48 and Corollary 43, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_k \times \mu_\mathcal{A}}[\mathrm{pd}] \geqslant \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A} \cap H} k \frac{\left|\mathcal{L}_G^{(k)}\right| \cdot \left|\mathcal{L}_H^{(k)}(\widetilde{\partial}_H a)\right|}{\left|\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}\right| \cdot |\mathcal{A}|} \in \Theta(k) \,,$$

proving $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\nu_k \times \mu_\mathcal{A}}[\mathrm{pd}] = \infty$ as claimed. □

Example 50. We see in particular that essential transitivity is necessary for the statement of Theorem 38:

Consider $M = G \times H$, where $G = H = \mathsf{A}_2$. The lattice of simple elements of $G = H$ and the acceptor Γ of $\mathcal{L}_G = \mathcal{L}_H$ are shown in Figure 6. One sees that all proper simple elements of G, respectively of H, and thus of M, are essential and the languages $\mathcal{L}_G$ and $\mathcal{L}_H$ are essentially transitive, and it is easy to check that $\beta_G = \beta_H = 2$. Hence, by Theorem 49, M has unbounded expected penetration distance.

Every proper simple element of M is essential, so M satisfies all the hypotheses of Theorem 38, except for essential transitivity.

5 Artin monoids

The aim of this section is to determine the essential simple elements of Artin monoids of spherical type and to determine when these monoids are essentially transitive.

In [Car13, Lemma 3.4], Caruso shows that, in our terminology, the language of normal forms of an Artin monoid of type A is essentially 5-transitive. In Lemmata 53 to 55 we will generalise Caruso's construction and reproduce this result in Proposition 56. We then go on to extend this result to all irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type.

For the rest of this section we will assume that M is an Artin monoid of spherical type with set of atoms $\mathcal{A}$.



Figure 6: The lattice of simple elements and the acceptor for the regular language of words in normal form for the monoid from Example 50.

Proposition 51. *Every proper simple element of M is essential, i.e. $\mathcal{E}ss = \mathcal{D}^\circ$.*

Proof. There are no proper simple elements in A_1, so we can assume that $|\mathcal{A}| > 1$. Given any $x \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ pick an atom $a \in F(x)$ and let $x_i = \widetilde{\bigvee} S(x_{i-1})$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, where $x_0 = x$. Then we have $a \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ and

$$\cdots |x_2|x_1|x|a|a| \cdots .$$

Recall that in any Artin monoid of spherical type, the Garside element is the ($\preccurlyeq$- and $\succcurlyeq$-) least common upper bound of the set of atoms. We obtain $x_i \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ by induction: If $x_{i-1} \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$, then $S(x_{i-1})$ and $\mathcal{A} \setminus S(x_{i-1})$ are both non-empty. Thus, x_i is the Garside element of a non-trivial proper parabolic submonoid of M; in particular, $x_i \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$. □

Proposition 52. *If M is reducible then it is not essentially transitive.*

Proof. If M is reducible then $M = M_1 \times M_2 \times \cdots \times M_k$ where the M_i are irreducible. Hence the claim follows by Proposition 33. □

Lemma 53. *Suppose that a and b are two atoms which lie in the same connected component of the Coxeter graph of M. Then there exist simple elements x and y such that $S(x) = \{a\}$, $F(x) = \{b\}$, $S(y) = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{a\}$ and $F(y) = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{b\}$.*

Proof. Suppose that we have an embedded path $a = a_1 \overset{i_1}{—} a_2 \overset{i_2}{—} \cdots \overset{i_{k-1}}{—} a_k = b$ in the Coxeter graph of M. Let $x = a_1 a_2 \cdots a_k$. There are no subwords which match any of the relations, hence $S(x) = \{a\}$ and $F(x) = \{b\}$. Furthermore, the only way x can be written as a product is as $x = (a_1 \cdots a_p)(a_{p+1} \cdots a_k)$, which can never be in normal form. Hence x has canonical length at most one, that is, x is a simple element.

Let $y = \partial(a_k \cdots a_2 a_1)$, then $S(y) = \mathcal{A} \setminus F(a_k \cdots a_2 a_1) = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{a\}$ and, similarly, $F(y) = \mathcal{A} \setminus S(a_k \cdots a_2 a_1) = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{b\}$. □

Suppose that $k \geqslant 2$ and that $1 — 2 — \cdots — (k-1)$ is a subgraph of the Coxeter graph of M, so we have a parabolic submonoid of type A_{k-1}. In this situation we have a map from A_{k-1} to the symmetric group on the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ given by mapping each atom i to the transposition $(i, i+1)$. This map is a bijection when we restrict to the set of simple elements of this submonoid.

Suppose that $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{A}_{k-1}}$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{A}_{k-1}}$ are an atom and a simple element of this submonoid. Let π be the permutation induced by x. Then we have that $a \in S(x)$ if and only if $\pi(a+1) < \pi(a)$, and $a \in F(X)$ if and only if $\pi^{-1}(a+1) < \pi^{-1}(a)$ [BB05, Proposition 1.5.3].

Lemma 54 ([Car13]). *Suppose that* $1 \text{ — } 2 \text{ —} \cdots \text{ — } (k-1)$, *where* $k \geqslant 2$, *is a subgraph of the Coxeter graph of* M. *Let* $u = u(1, 2, \ldots, k-1)$ *be the braid which corresponds to the permutation*

$$\pi_u = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor & \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 & \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor + 2 & \cdots & k \\ 2 & 4 & \cdots & 2\left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor & 1 & 3 & \cdots & 2\left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil - 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then one has

$$S(u) = \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \right\} \qquad F(u) = \left\{ 1, 3, \ldots, 2\left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \right\}.$$

Proof. It is clear that the only atom $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{A}_{k-1}}$ for which $\pi_u(a+1) < \pi_u(a)$ is $a = \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor$, hence $S(u) = \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$. Similarly, $\pi_u^{-1}(a+1) < \pi_u^{-1}(a)$ if and only if a is odd, hence $F(u)$ consists of all the odd atoms. □

Lemma 55 ([Car13]). *Suppose that* $1 \text{ — } 2 \text{ —} \cdots \text{ — } (k-1)$, *where* $k \geqslant 2$, *is a subgraph of the Coxeter graph of* M, *let* u *be the element defined in Lemma 54, and let*

$$v = v(1, 2, \ldots, k-1) = (\operatorname{rev} u) \cdot D \,,$$

where $D = \bigvee \left\{ a \in \mathcal{A}_M : a \neq \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$ *and* $\operatorname{rev} u$ *is the simple element obtained by reversing any expression of* u *as a product of atoms.*

Then v *is a simple element and its finishing set contains every atom except possibly* $\left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor$, *that is, one has* $F(v) \supseteq \mathcal{A}_M \smallsetminus \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$.

Proof. As $S(u) = \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$ we have that $F(\operatorname{rev} u) = \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$ hence $S(\partial \operatorname{rev} u) = \mathcal{A} \smallsetminus \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$. Therefore $\bigvee \left(\mathcal{A} \smallsetminus \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \right\} \right) \preccurlyeq \partial \operatorname{rev} u$ and so v is simple.

The element D is a Garside element of a parabolic submonoid of M, thus it is balanced, whence one has $\mathcal{A}_M \smallsetminus \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \right\} \subseteq F(D) \subseteq F(v)$. □

Proposition 56 ([Car13]). *Suppose that* M *is the Artin monoid of type* A_{n-1}, *where* $n - 1 \geqslant 2$.

$$1 \text{ — } 2 \text{ — } 3 \text{ —} \cdots\cdots \text{ — } (n-1)$$

Then M *is essentially 5-transitive.*

Proof. By Proposition 51, one has $\mathfrak{Ess} = \mathcal{D}^\circ \neq \varnothing$. Suppose $x, y \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$. We will construct elements $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ that satisfy $x|x_1|x_2|x_3|x_4|y$.

Suppose that a is an atom in the finishing set of x. By Lemma 53, there exists x_1 such that $S(x_1) = \{a\}$ and $F(x_1) = \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$. For $x_2 = u(1, 2, \ldots, n-1)$, we have $S(x_2) = \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$ by Lemma 54, and then $x|x_1|x_2$ by Corollary 11.

Similarly, suppose that b is an atom not in the starting set of y. By Lemma 53, there exists x_4 such that $F(x_4) = \mathcal{A} \smallsetminus \{b\}$ and $S(x_4) = \mathcal{A} \smallsetminus \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$. Let $x_3 = v(1, 2, \ldots, n-1)$, so by Lemma 55 we have $F(x_3) \supseteq \mathcal{A} \smallsetminus \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$, whence we have $x_3|x_4|y$ by Corollary 11.

It remains to show that $x_2|x_3$, or equivalently that $F(x_2) \supseteq S(x_3)$. We have $F(x_2) = \left\{ 1, 3, \ldots, 2\left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \right\}$ by Lemma 54.

Consider the permutation induced by $x_3 = v$. The permutation induced by $\operatorname{rev} u$ takes the set of even numbered strings to $\{1, 2, \ldots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$ and the set of odd numbered strings to $\{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 2, \ldots, n\}$, and $\bigvee \{a \in \mathcal{A}_M : a \neq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$ performs a half-twist on both of these subsets, so in particular leaves them invariant. Hence, for all $i > 0$ we have

$$(2i \pm 1) \cdot x_3 > \frac{n}{2} \geqslant (2i) \cdot x_3 \ ,$$

whence $S(x_3) = \{1, 3, \ldots 2 \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1\} = F(x_2)$, and so $x_2 | x_3$ by Corollary 11. □

Remark. Calculating powers of the adjacency matrices, it can be shown that the acceptor Γ_{A_n} has a diameter of 5 for $n \in \{4, 5, \ldots, 11\}$, so the statement of Proposition 56 cannot be sharpened in general. The diameter of Γ_{A_2} is 2 and the diameter of Γ_{A_3} is 4.

Proposition 57. *Suppose that M is the Artin monoid of type B_n, where $n \geqslant 2$.*



Then M is essentially 5-transitive.

Proof. Let $x_2 = u(1, 2, \ldots, n-1)$ and $x_3 = v(1, 2, \ldots, n-1)$. As in the proof of Proposition 56, it suffices to show that $S(x_3) \subseteq \{1, 3, \ldots 2 \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1\}$ by Corollary 11, Proposition 51, Lemma 53, Lemma 54, and Lemma 55.

Simple elements in B_n correspond to signed permutations of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. More precisely, the atoms $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$ correspond to the signed transpositions $(i, i+1)(-i, -(i+1))$ and the atom 0 corresponds to the signed transposition $(1, -1)$. The starting set of an element can be computed from its induced signed permutation [BB05, Proposition 8.1.2]: One has

$$S(x_3) = \{i \in \mathcal{A} : i \cdot x_3 > (i+1) \cdot x_3\} \ ,$$

where we use the convention $0 \cdot x_3 = 0$.

The signed permutation induced by $\operatorname{rev} u$ maps the set $\{1, 3, \ldots, 2\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil - 1\}$ to the set $\{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 2, \ldots, n\}$, and it maps the set $\{2, 4, \ldots, 2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$ to the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$. The action of $\bigvee \{a \in \mathcal{A}_M : a \neq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$ performs a half twist of the numbers greater than $\frac{n}{2}$ and changes the sign of the numbers $1, 2, \ldots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Hence, for all $i > 0$ we have

$$(2i \pm 1) \cdot x_3 > \frac{n}{2} > 0 > (2i) \cdot x_3$$

and thus $S(x_3) = \{1, 3, \ldots 2 \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1\}$. □

Remark. Calculating powers of the adjacency matrices, it can be shown that the acceptor Γ_{B_n} has a diameter of 5 for $n \in \{5, 6, 7, 8\}$, so the statement of Proposition 57 cannot be sharpened in general. The diameter of Γ_{B_2} is 2, and the acceptors Γ_{B_3} and Γ_{B_4} have a diameter of 4.

Proposition 58. *Suppose that M is the Artin monoid of type D_n, where $n \geqslant 3$.*



Then M is essentially 5-transitive.

Proof. Let $x_2 = u(1, 2, \ldots, n-1)$ and $x_3 = v(1, 2, \ldots, n-1)$. As in the proof of Proposition 56, it suffices to show that $S(x_3) \subseteq \{1, 3, \ldots 2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1\}$ by Corollary 11, Proposition 51, Lemma 53, Lemma 54, and Lemma 55.

Simple elements in D_n correspond to those signed permutations of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ that change the sign of an even number of integers. As in type B_n, the atoms $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ correspond to the signed transpositions $(i, i+1)(-i, -(i+1))$, but now the atom 0 corresponds to the signed transposition $(1, -2)(2, -1)$. The starting set can be computed from the induced signed permutation [BB05, Proposition 8.2.2]: One has

$$S(x_3) = \{i \in \mathcal{A} : i \cdot x_3 > (i+1) \cdot x_3\} ,$$

where we use the convention $0 \cdot x_3 = -2 \cdot x_3$.

The signed permutation induced by $\operatorname{rev} u$ maps the set $\{1, 3, \ldots, 2\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil - 1\}$ to the set $\{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 2, \ldots, n\}$, and it maps the set $\{2, 4, \ldots, 2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$ to the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$. The action of $\bigvee \{a \in \mathcal{A}_M : a \neq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$ performs a half twist of the numbers greater than $\frac{n}{2}$, changes the sign of the integers $2, 3, \ldots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, and the image of 1 is contained in $\{-1, 1\}$. Hence, for all $i > 0$ we have

$$(2i \pm 1) \cdot x_3 > \frac{n}{2} > 1 \geqslant (2i) \cdot x_3$$

as well as $0 \cdot x_3 = -2 \cdot x_3 \leqslant \frac{n}{2}$, whence $S(x_3) = \{1, 3, \ldots 2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1\}$. □

Remark. Calculating powers of the adjacency matrices, it can be shown that the acceptor Γ_{D_n} has a diameter of 5 for $n \in \{6, 7, 8\}$, so the statement of Proposition 58 cannot be sharpened in general. The acceptors Γ_{D_3}, Γ_{D_4} and Γ_{D_5} have a diameter of 4.

Note that the monoid A_4 is a parabolic submonoid of the monoid D_5, yet its acceptor has a larger diameter than that of the monoid D_5.

Proposition 59. *Suppose that M is the Artin monoid of type E_6.*



Then M is essentially 4-transitive.

Proof. Proposition 51 yields $\mathcal{Ess} = \mathcal{D}^\circ \neq \varnothing$. By Lemma 53 and Corollary 11, it suffices to construct an element $x_3 \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ with $S(x_3) = \{3\}$ and $F(x_3) = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{3\}$.

By a direct computation in the Coxeter group of type E_6, one readily verifies that the element $x_3 = 302134302154$ is simple and has the required starting and finishing sets. □

Remark. Calculating powers of the adjacency matrix, it can be shown that the diameter of Γ_{E_6} is 4, so the statement of Proposition 59 cannot be sharpened.

Proposition 60. *Suppose that M is the Artin monoid of type E_7.*



Then M is essentially 4-transitive.

Proof. Proposition 51 yields $\mathfrak{Ess} = \mathcal{D}^\circ \neq \varnothing$. By Lemma 53 and Corollary 11, it suffices to construct an element $x_3 \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ with $S(x_3) = \{3\}$ and $F(x_3) = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{3\}$.

By a direct computation in the Coxeter group of type E_7, one readily verifies that the element $x_3 = 302134302134543021654$ is simple and has the required starting and finishing sets. □

Remark. Calculating powers of the adjacency matrix, it can be shown that the diameter of Γ_{E_7} is 4, so the statement of Proposition 60 cannot be sharpened.

Proposition 61. *Suppose that M is the Artin monoid of type E_8.*



Then M is essentially 4-transitive.

Proof. Proposition 51 yields $\mathfrak{Ess} = \mathcal{D}^\circ \neq \varnothing$. By Lemma 53 and Corollary 11, it suffices to construct an element $x_3 \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ with $S(x_3) = \{3\}$ and $F(x_3) = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{3\}$.

By a direct computation in the Coxeter group of type E_8, one readily verifies that the element $x_3 = 3021343021345430213465430217654$ is simple and has the required starting and finishing sets. □

Remark. Calculating powers of the adjacency matrix, it can be shown that the diameter of Γ_{E_8} is 4, so the statement of Proposition 61 cannot be sharpened.

Proposition 62. *Suppose that M is the Artin monoid of type H_3.*



Then M is essentially 3-transitive.

Proof. Proposition 51 yields $\mathfrak{Ess} = \mathcal{D}^\circ \neq \varnothing$. By Lemma 53 and Corollary 11, it suffices to construct for every atom $a \in \mathcal{A}$ an element $x_a \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ such that $S(x_a) = \{a\}$ and $F(x_a) = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{2\}$.

By a direct computation in the Coxeter group of type H_3, one readily verifies that the elements $x_1 = 1213$, $x_2 = 213$ and $x_3 = 321213$ are simple and have the required starting and finishing sets. □

Remark. Calculating powers of the adjacency matrix, it can be shown that the diameter of Γ_{H_3} is 3, so the statement of Proposition 62 cannot be sharpened.

Proposition 63. *Suppose that M is the Artin monoid of type H_4.*



Then M is essentially 3-transitive.

Proof. Proposition 51 yields $\mathfrak{Ess} = \mathcal{D}^\circ \neq \varnothing$. By Lemma 53 and Corollary 11, it suffices to construct for every atom $a \in \mathcal{A}$ an element $x_a \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ such that $S(x_a) = \{a\}$ and $F(x_a) = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{2\}$.

By a direct computation in the Coxeter group of type H_4, one readily verifies that the elements $x_1 = 121232143$, $x_2 = 21232143$, $x_3 = 32121343$ and $x_4 = 43212132123432121 34$ are simple and have the required starting and finishing sets. □

Remark. Calculating powers of the adjacency matrix, it can be shown that the diameter of Γ_{H_4} is 3, so the statement of Proposition 63 cannot be sharpened.

Proposition 64. *Suppose that M is the Artin monoid of type F_4.*

$$1 \text{ — } 2 \overset{4}{\text{—}} 3 \text{ — } 4$$

Then M is essentially 3-transitive.

Proof. By Proposition 51, one has $\mathcal{E}ss = \mathcal{D}^\circ \neq \varnothing$. By Corollary 11, it suffices to construct for every atom $a \in \mathcal{A}$ an element $x_a \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ such that $S(x_a) = \{a\}$ and $F(x_a) = \{1, 3\}$ as well as an element $x_{\bar{a}} \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ such that $S(x_{\bar{a}}) = \{1, 3\}$ and $F(x_{\bar{a}}) = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{a\}$.

By a direct computation in the Coxeter group of type F_4, one readily verifies that the elements

$$\begin{array}{llll} x_1 = 1232143 & x_2 = 213 & x_3 = 3213 & x_4 = 43213 \\ x_{\bar{1}} = 132132343234 & x_{\bar{2}} = 1321343 & x_{\bar{3}} = 13214 & x_{\bar{4}} = 12321324321323 \end{array}$$

are simple and have the required starting and finishing sets. □

Remark. Calculating powers of the adjacency matrix, it can be shown that the diameter of Γ_{F_4} is 3, so the statement of Proposition 64 cannot be sharpened.

We note that, for $a \in \{1, 4\}$, there exists no simple element x satisfying $S(x) = \{a\}$ and $|F(x)| = 3$, and there exists no simple element x satisfying $|S(x)| = 1$ and $F(x) = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{a\}$. Hence, it is not possible to argue as in the proofs of Proposition 62 and Proposition 63.

Proposition 65. *Suppose that M is the Artin monoid of type $\mathsf{I}_2(p)$, with $p \geqslant 3$.*

$$1 \overset{p}{\text{—}} 2$$

Then M is essentially 2-transitive.

Proof. We have $p \geqslant 3$ by assumption, so 12 and 21 are distinct proper simple elements. The proper simple elements fall into one of four types:

$$\begin{array}{llll} \text{(a)} & 2(12)^k = (21)^k 2 & (2k+1 < p) & \text{(b)} \quad 1(21)^k 2 \quad (2k+2 < p) \\ \text{(c)} & 2(12)^k 1 & (2k+2 < p) & \text{(d)} \quad 1(21)^k = (12)^k 1 \quad (2k+1 < p) \end{array}$$

For $t \in \{\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{d}\}$, let t_1 and t_2 denote two arbitrary simple elements of type (t). We then have

$$\begin{array}{llll} \mathrm{a}_1|\mathrm{a}_2 & \mathrm{a}_1|21|\mathrm{b}_2 & \mathrm{a}_1|\mathrm{c}_2 & \mathrm{a}_1|21|\mathrm{d}_2 \\ \mathrm{b}_1|\mathrm{a}_2 & \mathrm{b}_1|21|\mathrm{b}_2 & \mathrm{b}_1|\mathrm{c}_2 & \mathrm{b}_1|21|\mathrm{d}_2 \\ \mathrm{c}_1|12|\mathrm{a}_2 & \mathrm{c}_1|\mathrm{b}_2 & \mathrm{c}_1|12|\mathrm{c}_2 & \mathrm{c}_1|\mathrm{d}_2 \\ \mathrm{d}_1|12|\mathrm{a}_2 & \mathrm{d}_1|\mathrm{b}_2 & \mathrm{d}_1|12|\mathrm{c}_2 & \mathrm{d}_1|\mathrm{d}_2 \end{array}$$

and thus M is 2-transitive. □

Combining Propositions 56 to 65 with the classification of Artin monoids of spherical type from Theorem 12 and Proposition 52, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 66. *Let M be an Artin monoid of spherical type with more than one atom.*

The language of normal forms in M is essentially transitive if and only if M is irreducible. Moreover, if the language is essentially transitive then it is essentially 5-transitive.

Corollary 67. *Let M be an irreducible Artin monoid of spherical type, let ν_k be the uniform probability measure on $\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}$, and let $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the uniform probability distribution on the set $\mathcal{A}$ of atoms of M.*

The expected value $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_k \times \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}[\mathrm{pd}]$ of the penetration distance with respect to $\nu_k \times \mu_{\mathcal{A}}$ is uniformly bounded (that is, bounded independently of k).

Proof. Corollary 39, Proposition 51 and Theorem 66 imply the claim. □

Recall that β_M is the exponential growth rate of the regular language $\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}$.

Lemma 68. *If M is an irreducible Artin monoid of spherical type with more than one atom, then one has $\beta_M > 1$.*

Proof. Consider two atoms $a \neq b$ of M. As $\mathcal{L}_M$ is essentially transitive, there exist $s_1, \dots, s_k, t_1, \dots, t_\ell \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ such that $a|s_1| \cdots |s_k|b|t_1| \cdots t_\ell|a$. Moreover, we have $a|a| \cdots |a$ by Corollary 11. Thus, one has $\mathcal{L}_M^{(1+N(k+\ell+2))} \geqslant 2^N$, showing the claim. □

Corollary 69. *Let $M = G \bowtie H$, where G and H are irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type with more than one atom, let ν_k be the uniform probability measure on $\mathcal{L}_M^{(k)}$, and let $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the uniform probability distribution on the set $\mathcal{A}$ of atoms of M.*

The expected value $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_k \times \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}[\mathrm{pd}]$ diverges, that is, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\nu_k \times \mu_{\mathcal{A}}}[\mathrm{pd}] = \infty$.

Proof. The claim follows from Theorem 49, Proposition 51, Theorem 66 and Lemma 68. □

In the terminology of this paper, Dehornoy asked in [Deh07, Question 3.13] whether for the braid monoid, that is in the situation $M = \mathsf{A}_n$, one has $\left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(s)\right| \in \Theta\left(\left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}\right|\right)$ for all $s \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$, where

$$\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(s) := \overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)} \cap \mathcal{D}^* \,.\, s = \left\{ s_1 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, s_k \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)} \,:\, s_k = s \right\}.$$

The answer is affirmative for all irreducible Artin monoids of spherical type:

Corollary 70. *If M is an irreducible Artin monoid of spherical type with more than one atom and $s \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$, then one has $\left|\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(s)\right| \in \Theta\left(\left|\mathcal{L}^{(k)}\right|\right)$.*

Proof. The claim follows from Lemma 48, Proposition 51 and Theorem 66. □

Corollary 71. *If M is an irreducible Artin monoid of spherical type and $s \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$, then one has $\left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(s)\right| \in \Theta\left(\left|\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}\right|\right)$.*

Proof. The claim is vacuously true if M has only one atom, so we may assume otherwise. In this case, we have $\left|\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(s)\right| \in \Theta\left(\left|\mathcal{L}^{(k)}\right|\right)$ by Corollary 70 and $\beta > 1$ by Lemma 68. The claim then follows from $\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)}(s) = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{k} \Delta^{k-j}\mathcal{L}^{(j)}(s)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(k)} = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{k} \Delta^{k-j}\mathcal{L}^{(j)}$ and Lemma 40. □

References

[BB05] Anders Björner and Francesco Brenti. *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*, volume 231 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2005. MR2133266 (2006d:05001)

[BS72] Egbert Brieskorn and Kyoji Saito. Artin-Gruppen und Coxeter-Gruppen. *Invent. Math.*, 17:245–271, 1972. MR0323910 (48 #2263)

[Car13] Sandrine Caruso. On the genericity of pseudo-Anosov braids I: rigid braids. arXiv:1306.3757 [math.GT], 2013. arXiv:1306.3757

[Cha95] Ruth Charney. Geodesic automation and growth functions for Artin groups of finite type. *Math. Ann.*, 301(2):307–324, 1995. MR1314589 (95k:20055)

[Cox35] H. S. M. Coxeter. The complete enumeration of finite groups of the form $R_i^2 = (R_i R_j)^{k_{ij}} = 1$. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.*, s1-10(1):21–25, 1935.

[DDG+15] Patrick Dehornoy, François Digne, Eddy Godelle, Daan Krammer, and Jean Michel. *Foundations of Garside theory*, volume 22 of *EMS Tracts in Mathematics*. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2015. MR3362691

[Deh02] Patrick Dehornoy. Groupes de Garside. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 35(2):267–306, 2002. MR1914933 (2003f:20068)

[Deh07] Patrick Dehornoy. Combinatorics of normal sequences of braids. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 114(3):389–409, 2007. MR2310741 (2008f:20078)

[Del72] Pierre Deligne. Les immeubles des groupes de tresses généralisés. *Invent. Math.*, 17:273–302, 1972. MR0422673 (54 #10659)

[DP99] Patrick Dehornoy and Luis Paris. Gaussian groups and Garside groups, two generalisations of Artin groups. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 79(3):569–604, 1999. MR1710165 (2001f:20061)

[ECH+92] David B. A. Epstein, James W. Cannon, Derek F. Holt, Silvio V. F. Levy, Michael S. Paterson, and William P. Thurston. *Word processing in groups*. Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Boston, MA, 1992. MR1161694 (93i:20036)

[Fro07] Bradley Froehle. An introduction to combinatorial Garside structures. Senior thesis, University of Minnesota, May 2007.

[GKP94] Ronald L. Graham, Donald E. Knuth, and Oren Patashnik. *Concrete mathematics*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA, 1994. MR1397498 (97d:68003)

[God07] Eddy Godelle. Parabolic subgroups of Garside groups. *J. Algebra*, 317(1):1–16, 2007. MR2360138 (2008h:20054)

[GT14] Volker Gebhardt and Stephen Tawn. Normal forms of random braids. *J. Algebra*, 408:115–137, 2014. MR3197175

[GT16] Volker Gebhardt and Stephen Tawn. Zappa-Szép products of Garside monoids. *Math. Z.*, 282:341–369, 2016.

[KV83] V. A. Kaĭmanovich and A. M. Vershik. Random walks on discrete groups: boundary and entropy. *Ann. Probab.*, 11(3):457–490, 1983. MR704539 (85d:60024)

[MM07] Jean Mairesse and Frédéric Mathéus. Randomly growing braid on three strands and the manta ray. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 17(2):502–536, 2007. MR2308334 (2007m:60012)

[Pic01] Matthieu Picantin. The center of thin Gaussian groups. *J. Algebra*, 245(1):92–122, 2001. MR1868185 (2002h:20053)

[Shu08] Arseny M. Shur. Combinatorial complexity of regular languages. In *Computer science—theory and applications*, volume 5010 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 289–301. Springer, Berlin, 2008. MR2475168 (2010c:68076)

[TW89] Bit Shun Tam and Shiow Fang Wu. On the Collatz-Wielandt sets associated with a cone-preserving map. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 125:77–95, 1989. MR1024484 (90i:15021)

[Woe00] Wolfgang Woess. *Random walks on infinite graphs and groups*, volume 138 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000. MR1743100 (2001k:60006)

Volker Gebhardt
v.gebhardt@westernsydney.edu.au

Stephen Tawn
stephen@tawn.co.uk
http://www.stephentawn.info

Western Sydney University
Centre for Research in Mathematics
Locked Bag 1797, Penrith NSW 2751, Australia
http://www.westernsydney.edu.au/crm